	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/775,886	MATSUNAMI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kaushikkumar Patel	2188	

All Participants:

Status of Application: *Applicant filed amendments in response to first office action.*

(1) *Kaushikkumar Patel.*

(3) _____.

(2) *Shrinath Malur.*

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *27 December 2006*

Time: _____

Type of Interview:
- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
Yes, Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Claims discussed:
39

Prior art documents discussed:
No

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

 Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During the interview, Examiner explained the reasons why the claims lacks enablement of independent claims. According to present application specification, pages 22-27, it is understood that the policies are applied per application basis but not by the application that created the file, hence the claims as written "application creating the file applies the policies" lacks the enablement..